

**REMARKS**

The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for thoroughly reviewing and considering the pending application. The Office Action dated October 4, 2005 has been received and carefully reviewed. Claims 1-3 and 7 have been amended. New claims 8 and 9 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention, as discussed in the Office Action. The Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, and 7, as noted above, so that the claims now more clearly set forth the subject matter. As such, the Applicant requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action also rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,842,929 to *Kim et al.* (hereinafter “*Kim*”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

As required in Chapter 2131 of the M.P.E.P., in order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. §102, “the reference must teach every element of the claim.” The Applicant respectfully submits that *Kim* does not teach every element recited in claims 1-7. More specifically, claim 1 recites a washing machine control method which includes “calculating a water level reduction rate based on the set first water level and the sensed second water level” and determining an optimum water re-supply amount “by comparing the calculated water level reduction rate to a predetermined value.” *Kim* does not teach at least these features.

While the Applicant agrees *Kim* does disclose a water absorption rate, it does not specifically teach calculating a water level reduction rate based on a first water level and a second water level. Nor does *Kim* teach determining an optimum water re-supply amount by comparing a calculated water level reduction rate to a predetermined value. If the Examiner

disagrees, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner point out the column and line numbers where *Kim* teaches these specific features. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that *Kim* does not anticipate claims 1-7 and requests that the rejection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Applicant has added new claim 9. The Applicant submits that claim 9 recites a washing machine control method which includes “calculating a water level reduction rate by comparing the first water level and the second water level over time” and “determining a water re-supply amount by comparing the calculated water level reduction rate to a predetermined value” which are not disclosed in the cited references.

The application is in a condition for allowance and favorable action is respectfully solicited. If for any reason the Examiner believes a conversation with the Applicant’s representative would facilitate the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Dated: March 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By  *Yung Cui*  
Mark R. Kresloff *Rs No 43,324*  
Registration No.: 42,766  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant